Reply to Office Action of March 17, 2006

Docket No.: 0042-0492P Art Unit: 1731

Page 3 of 5

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present

application. Claims 1, 3, and 8-13 have been cancelled herein without prejudice to or

disclaimer of the subject matter set forth therein. Claims 2, 4, and 5 were previously

cancelled. Independent claims 6 and 7 are currently being prosecuted, and each has been

amended. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider her rejections in view of the

Amendments and Remarks as set forth hereinbelow.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that 6 has been allowed.

Acknowledgement Of Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner acknowledged has acknowledged the IDS filed on April 19, 2005.

Claims Objections

Objected-to claim 8 has been cancelled.

Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1, 3, 7, and 8 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-

type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 7 of copending Application No.

10/767,056. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to

advance prosecution of the instant application, the Applicants are herewith submitting a

IMS/CTT/eb Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

Docket No.: 0042-0492P

Art Unit: 1731
Page 4 of 5

Terminal Disclaimer disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on the present

application which would extend beyond the expiration of any patent which issues from U.S.

Application No. 10/767,056 Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are

respectfully requested. Independent claim 7 should now be in condition for allowance

<u> § 103 Rejection</u>

Claims 1, 3, and 8-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over

CN 2031615 in view of Doubrava et al. (U.S. 6,797,033) and Tani et al. (U.S. 6,457,475).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the examiner's rejection, but merely to

advance the prosecution of the present application, claims 1, 3, and 8-13 have been

cancelled. Therefore this rejection should be withdrawn.

<u>CONCLUSION</u>

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the

patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone or in combination.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite

prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen at

(703) 208-4030 in the Washington, D.C. area.

JMS/CTT/eb

Application No. 10/767,057 Amendment filed June 16, 2006 Reply to Office Action of March 17, 2006 Docket No.: 0042-0492P Art Unit: 1731 Page 5 of 5

£50,786

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Date: June 16, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

James M. Slattery

Registration No.: 28,380

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

Attachment: Terminal Disclaimer